

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are in the present application. The Office Action and cited references have been considered. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is thanked for the courtesies extended during the personal interview on March 6, 2012. The present amendment is being submitted in accordance with the discussions during that interview. During the interview, as correctly reflected in the Examiner's Interview Summary Record, the Examiner agreed that if the claim amendments discussed during the interview were submitted in a response, they would overcome the art of record. The present amendments are the ones discussed during the interview.

Claims 1-4, 9-14 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,658,573 to Bischof. Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Bischof in view of Montgomery (U.S. Patent No. 7,127,605). Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Bischof in view of Montgomery (U.S. Patent No. 7,217,605). Claims 7, 8 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Bischof in view of Montgomery and de Jong (U.S. Patent No. 7,130,549). Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Bischof in view of de Jong. These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 now recites a method for controlling access to data handled by references in a system for executing programs, the programs including processes and tasks, wherein upon executing a program, the method comprises the steps of 1) having

the system store an entire set of licit references which the program obtains by means considered as licit, wherein a reference identifies at least one a pointer or data of the program, the data including structures, objects, and tables, said licit reference being stored when introducing into the program said reference by a licit means and when this licit reference is not already stored, wherein a reference is considered to be licit when that reference was obtained in a manner permissible in accordance with a system, context and program being used, and a reference is considered not licit when that reference was not obtained in a manner permissible in accordance with the system, context and program being used; 2) before any operation intended to be forbidden in case the operation deals with values which are not licit references, having the system check that the values are among the licit references which have been stored for this program, and 3) accepting the operation, responsive to the step of checking, when the checking determines the values are among the licit references, and rejecting the operation responsive to the step of checking, when said checking determines the values are not among the licit references. This is not taught, disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record.

The remarks presented in the previous response are incorporated herein by reference. Further, as discussed during the interview, Bischof does not teach storing a set of licit references, as that term is now defined in claim 1. In particular, “***wherein a reference identifies at least one a pointer or data of the program, the data including structures, objects, and tables . . . a reference is considered to be licit when that reference was obtained in a manner permissible in accordance with a***

system, context and program being used, and a reference is considered not licit when that reference was not obtained in a manner permissible in accordance with the system, context and program being used'. Support for this amendment is found, for example, at page 3, lines 8-16; page 5, lines 10-29; and page 6, lines 3-26. As this feature is not disclosed nor suggested in the other cited documents, claim 1 is new with respect to the cited documents whether taken alone or in combination.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the prior art of record. Claims 2-17 are believed to be patentable in and of themselves, and as they depend from and include the limitations of claim 1 which is patentable for the reasons discussed above.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections of record. Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and early notice to this effect is most earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at 202-628-5197.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By /Ronni S. Jillions/
Ronni S. Jillions
Registration No. 31,979

RSJ:me
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\G\Gema\Leroy4\Pto\2012-03-21Amendment.doc